

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JANE DOE,

Plaintiff,

v.

METROPOLITAN LIFE INSURANCE  
COMPANY,

Defendant.

Case No. [16-cv-02298-MEJ](#)

**ORDER RE: PERMISSION TO  
PROCEED UNDER PSEUDONYM**

Plaintiff Jane Doe filed this case on April 27, 2016 using a pseudonym. Ordinarily, pleadings must identify the parties to a suit. Fed. R. Civ. P. 10(a). Nevertheless, “a party may preserve his or her anonymity in judicial proceedings in special circumstances when the party’s need for anonymity outweighs prejudice to the opposing party and the public’s interest in knowing the party’s identity.” *Does I through XXIII v. Advanced Textile Corp.*, 214 F.3d 1058, 1068 (9th Cir. 2000). In evaluating the need for anonymity, the Court considers (1) the severity of the threatened harm, (2) the reasonableness of the anonymous party’s fears, (3) the anonymous party’s vulnerability to retaliation; and (4) the prejudice to the opposing party and whether proceedings may be structured to avoid that prejudice. *Id.* Additionally, the Court “must decide whether the public’s interest in the case would be best served by requiring that the litigants reveal their identities.” *Id.*

Accordingly, prior to the issuance of summons in this case, the Court **ORDERS** Plaintiff to file a motion for leave to proceed under the Jane Doe pseudonym.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: May 11, 2016

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
MARIA-ELENA JAMES  
United States Magistrate Judge